

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 697

RC 011 724

AUTHOR Bottenfield, James F.: And Others
 TITLE Iowa Annual Evaluation Report for Migrant Programs.
 Fiscal Year 1979.
 INSTITUTION Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des
 Moines.
 SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
 (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory
 Education.
 PUB DATE Nov 79
 NOTE 49p.: For related document, see ED 148 520
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement: Annual Reports: Bilingual
 Education: Educational Programs: Elementary Secondary
 Education: Enrollment: *Instructional Programs:
 Interagency Cooperation: Language Programs: *Migrant
 Education: Multicultural Education: Parent
 Participation: *Program Effectiveness: Program
 Evaluation: Staff Improvement: *State Programs;
 *Summer Programs
 IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

Tabular data and narrative evaluations describe the goals and achievements of Iowa's migrant education programs (three summer session and five regular session programs) operated during fiscal year 1979. A program overview provides summary information on staff utilization, numbers of students served, inservice training activities, medical services provided for students, parent involvement, procedures for recruiting students and establishing their educational needs, cooperation between schools and other agencies, and methods of disseminating information about migrant program activities. Statewide instructional information is presented in tables showing curriculum areas, ages and numbers of students participating, and numbers of students meeting the standards of success in each area. Student success was measured by standardized tests, teacher-made tests, criterion referenced tests, checklists, and observation. Narrative evaluations for three programs provide a brief program description, a summary of objectives and success in meeting objectives, and recommendations based on program strengths and weaknesses. Information about academic gains, enrollment, and attendance is provided in tables. Serving predominately Spanish-speaking students, the programs stressed language development and employed bilingual, bicultural methods. (JH)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED180697

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Year 1979



Department of Public Instruction

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James F.
Bottomfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

State of Iowa
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Jolly Ann Davidson, President, Clarinda
John E. van der Linden, Vice President, Sibley
Cornelius Bodine, Jr., Sioux City
William N. Cropp, Des Moines
Karen K. Goodenow, Wall Lake
Virginia Harper, Fort Madison
Robert G. Koons, Clinton
Susan M. Wilson, Waterloo
Harold Yeoman, Monticello

ADMINISTRATION

Robert D. Benton, State Superintendent and Executive Officer
of the State Board of Public Instruction
David H. Bechtel, Administrative Assistant
James E. Mitchell, Deputy State Superintendent

Pupil Personnel Services Branch

Drexel D. Lange, Associate Superintendent
Oliver T. Himley, Chief, Title I, ESEA
James F. Bottenfield, Migrant Consultant, Title I, ESEA

I O W A
A N N U A L E V A L U A T I O N R E P O R T
F O R M I G R A N T P R O G R A M S
F I S C A L Y E A R 1 9 7 9

Title I of Public Law 89-10
The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
As Amended

State of Iowa
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines, Iowa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff.	1
Inservice for Staff	2
Medical	4
Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs	4
Parent Involvement	5
Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies	6
Dissemination	6
SEA Contact with LEAs	6
Instructional Activities	7
Columbus Regular School Program Narrative Evaluation	11
Description of the Program	13
Objectives of the Program	14
Completion of Initial Objectives	14
Successes of the Program	16
Areas of Weakness in the Program	17
Recommendations	17
Muscatine Summer School Program Narrative Evaluation	27
Introduction	29
Mathematics and Language Development Program	29
Program Goals	30
Performance Objectives	30
Language Development Evaluation	31
Program Critique	31
West Liberty Regular School Program Narrative Evaluation	41

TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Regular School Term)	8
Statewide Migrant Instructional Activities (Summer School Term)	9

Columbus Narrative Evaluation

ATTACHMENT A

Achievement of Objectives by Migrant Students	19
---	----

ATTACHMENT B

Migrant Non-Participants	23
------------------------------------	----

ATTACHMENT C

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Migrant Students.	24
---	----

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Eligible Non-Participants . .	25
---	----

Muscatine Narrative Evaluation

ATTACHMENT A

Attendance Comparison	33
---------------------------------	----

ATTACHMENT B

(1) Muscatine Enrollment Report	34
(2) West Liberty Enrollment Report	37
(3) L & M Enrollment Report	38

ATTACHMENT C

Language Development (Reading).	39
Language Development (Math)	40

IOWA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
FOR MIGRANT PROGRAMS

Title I, ESEA
Fiscal Year 1979

During Fiscal Year 1979, there were seven migrant educational programs operational in Iowa. There were five programs operational during the regular school year and three programs during the summer months.

I. Unduplicated Number of Children and Staff

There were one hundred ninety-one children served by educational program activities during the regular school year. The breakdown in migrant classifications was thirteen intrastate, one hundred two interstate, and seventy-six five-year provisional. One hundred fifty-six of the children were classified as being Spanish Language dominant.

The staffing for the regular year programs included nine professional, three paraprofessional, and two volunteer aides. Six of the professional staff members were bilingual in Spanish and English. The two paraprofessional members were also bilingual in the two languages. In addition to the migrant funded staff, there were three bilingual professionals funded by regular Title I program funds.

There were two hundred thirteen children in attendance during the summer school term. The breakdown in migrant classification was eleven intrastate, ninety-three interstate, and one hundred nine five-year provisional. One hundred sixty-four of these children were classified as being Spanish Language dominant.

The summer term staffing included fifteen professional

and seven paraprofessional for the educational program activities. Additional personnel included five food service, one social worker, two nurses, and five bus drivers, funded by Title I migrant monies.

The preschool and day care services for migrant children were ably handled under the auspices of Migrant Action Program Inc.. In the areas of transportation and recruiting, joint funding of Title I migrant funds and Migrant Action Program funds were utilized; however, in the main, the preschool and day care program was funded and carried out by Migrant Action Program personnel. There were thirty-three children served by a staff of thirteen attendants. They also provided one nurse, a medical education mobil unit with a staff of two, two food services people, two transportation, and one recruiter. This information pertains only to the three Title I migrant education summer programs and does not begin to reflect the total program of services provided to migrants by the Migrant Action Program.

II. Inservice for Staff

Inservice training and staff development activities during the regular school term as reported by the LEAs, indicate a considerable range. The activities and a duplicated count of staff members participating are as follows:

- A. Discussion by staff of individual children --
(Thirteen teachers, two aides, two nurses, and six administrators)
- B. Methods in curriculum in migrant education --
(Six teachers, two aides, and two administrators)

- C. Individualized instruction/grouping techniques --
(Seven teachers, two aides, and two administrators)
- D. Classroom management techniques -- (two teachers,
two aides, and two administrators)
- E. Preschool education -- (Two teachers and two
administrators)
- F. Developing teacher made tests -- (Two teachers
and one administrator)
- G. Oral language development -- (Three teachers and
one administrator)
- H. SEA sponsored MSRTS workshops on skills trans-
mittal -- (Four teachers, three record clerks,
and two administrators.

A total of seventeen days were set aside for inservice training by the five LEAs with a range of two to six days for the individual schools.

The summer school inservice and staff development activities were as follows:

- A. Writing behavioral objectives -- (Two teachers)
- B. Discussion by staff of individual children --
(Nine teachers, six aides, one nurse, one food
service, two administrators, and one transportation)
- C. Methods in curriculum in migrant education --
(Two teachers, two aides, and two administrators)
- D. Individualized instruction/grouping techniques --
(Nine teachers, two aides, and two administrators)
- E. Classroom management techniques -- (Nine teachers,
six aides, and two administrators)

- F. SEA sponsored MSRTS workshop on skills transmittal --
(Five teachers, one clerk, and one administrator)
- G. Preschool education -- (Three teachers, one administrator)

III. Medical

During the regular school term, all of the migrant children received a physical screening by the school nurses. As a follow-up to the initial screenings, additional referrals were made to dentists and doctors.

During the regular school term there were twenty-two children who received a dental screening and nine of them received dental treatment. There were twenty-two children referred for additional physical examination and twenty of them received medical treatment.

During the summer school term, thirty-eight children received a dental screening and fifteen of them were given dental treatment. Seventy-four children received physical examinations and eighteen received medical assistance.

IV. Recruiting and Establishing Educational Needs

The recruitment of migrant children during the regular and summer school terms utilized a variety of methods. School personnel visited the migrant camps and established contact with the parents. They were assisted by the migrant families in locating isolated migrant families. Contact was made with the growers who supplied approximate dates of arrival of the migrants. Some parents voluntarily sent their children when the school bus made its' daily rounds.

In establishing the educational needs of the children, the schools utilized teacher judgment backed up by standardized testing, criterion reference tests, teacher made tests, and parent referrals.

V. Parent Involvement

The regular school term reports from the LEAs indicated an unduplicated count of forty-eight parents involved. The areas of parent involvement break down as follows:

- A. Attended orientation meetings (Twenty-one parents)
- B. Involved in planning project activities (Nine parents)
- C. Classroom or program visitation (Forty-eight parents)
- D. Active in recruitment or support of project activities (Five parents)
- E. Acted as aides (Four parents)
- F. Contacted by school staff at home (Sixty-five parents)

The summer school term reports from the LEAs indicated an unduplicated count of seventy-four parents involved. The parent involvement breaks down as follows:

- A. Attended orientation meetings (Eleven parents)
- B. Involved in planning project activities (Six parents)
- C. Classroom or program visitation (Twenty parents)
- D. Active in recruitment or support of project activities (Five parents)

- E. Helped supervise field trips (One parent)
- F. Acted as aides, paid or volunteer (One parent)
- G. Contacted by school staff at home (Sixty-nine parents)

VI. Cooperation With Other Programs and Agencies

There was excellent cooperation by other agencies in assisting the LEAs to provide a well-balanced program of services to the migrant children. These agencies were: Migrant Action Program, County Health Departments, Iowa State Employment Service, Iowa Department of Social Services, Community Action Agencies, Local Title I Projects, Child Nutrition Programs, Head Start, Local Migrant Councils, and Area Education Agencies.

VII. Dissemination

Dissemination of information concerning the Title I migrant program activities as reported by the LEAs were:

- A. Parent advisory council meetings-
- B. Home and camp visits with parents-
- C. Parent meetings at scheduled events and during drop-in intervals at school-
- D. School program newsletters-
- E. Regular press and radio information-

VIII. SEA Contact With LEAs

Contact between the state and local educational agencies was throughout the year. These contacts were on a formal and an informal basis. Assistance was given in completion of the application forms. Consultations were held with each LEA during

the planning phase of their program. Visitations were made to each of the LEAs during their program operation.

IX. Instructional Activities

The LEAs reported that, in their opinion, the instructional activities were successful. The following composite of types of activities and participants by age, fairly represents the program offered to the children.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

INSTRUCTIONS: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicates

REGULAR
SCHOOL
TERM

- A. The number of participants by age level.
B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level.

- C. Total number of participants per activity.
D. The methods utilized in determining success.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL						C. Total No. of parti- cipients	D. CHECK ONE OR MORE METHODS UTILIZED IN DETERMINING SUCCESS					
		3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 16		Standard- ized Tests	Teacher- Made Tests	Criterion Reference	Checklists	Observation	Other
Mathematics	A		21	16	13	14	14	78	X	X	X	X	X	
	B		17	13	11	10	10							
Language Arts/ Reading	A	7	41	35	33	26	20	162	X	X	X	X	X	
	B	4	33	30	29	23	15							
Physical Education	A													
	B													
Fine Arts	A													
	B													
Cultural Development	A		21	14	15	14	16	80				X	X	
	B		21	14	15	14	10							
Health/ Nutrition	A													
	B													
Environment	A													
	B													
Science	A													
	B													
Self Image	A	10	21	14	15	14	16	80		X		X	X	
	B	10	21	14	14	10	10							
Music/Dance	A													
	B													
Social Studies	A													15
	B													
Oral Communication	A	7	41	35	33	29	23	168	X	X	X	X	X	
	B	7	41	34	30	24	21							
Other	A													
	B													

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

INSTRUCTIONS: This page is to be utilized in recording success data. Beside each activity that was part of your project indicates:

A. The number of participants by age level.

B. The number meeting your standard(s) of success by age level.

C. Total number of participants per activity.

D. The methods utilized in determining success.

SUMMER PROGRAMS

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY		AGE LEVEL						c. Total No. of participants	d. CHECK ONE OR MORE METHODS UTILIZED IN DETERMINING SUCCESS					
		3 - 5	6 - 8	9 - 10	11 - 12	13 - 14	15 - 16		Standardized Tests	Teacher-Made Tests	Criterion Reference	Checklists	Observation	Other
Mathematics	A	21	69	28	32	25		175	X	X	X	X		
	B	17	61	26	26	19								
Language Arts/Reading	A	21	64	28	32	25		170	X	X	X	X		
	B	16	54	24	25	19								
Physical Education	A		15	5	6	5		31				X	X	
	B		15	5	6	5								
Fine Arts	A		15	5	6	5		31					X	
	B		15	5	6	5								
Cultural Development	A		15	5	6	5		31				X	X	
	B		15	5	6	5								
Health/Nutrition	A		15	5	6	5		31					X	
	B		15	5	6	5								
Environment	A													
	B													
Science	A													
	B													
Self Image	A	20	43	18	16	6		103		X		X	X	
	B	13	34	7	10	4								
Music/Dance	A		15	5	6	5		31					X	
	B		15	5	6	5								
Social Studies	A													
	B													
Oral Communication	A	20	58	23	22	11		134	X	X	X	X	X	
	B	12	51	19	16	9								
Other	A													
	B													

16

17

COLUMBUS REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Narrative Evaluation

by
Thomas J. Renze

COLUMBUS REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1979

Narrative Evaluation

Description of the Program

Thirty-two students were initially identified as being eligible to participate in the program under the category of migrant students. Seventeen of these students were classified as current migrants and fifteen were classified as settled migrants. Twenty-three students were elementary age, five junior high age, and four high school age. Twenty-five of the eligible students were placed in the program at some point in the school year. The seven who did not participate included one kindergarten student, one third grade student, three fifth grade students, one ninth grade student, and one tenth grade student. Pretesting, conferences with students and classroom teachers, and the professional judgment of the migrant teachers, were the basis for the decision not to place these students. One full time bilingual teacher was employed for the program. The program's expenses were met largely by Title I migrant funds, with district funds used to cover the rest of the costs.

At the beginning of the school year, a large number of children classified as current migrant enrolled in the school system. The elementary aged children were strongly Spanish dominant, some speaking no English. Consequently, these students demanded the full attention of the migrant teacher during the time of their enrollment. The migrant teacher was instrumental in visiting the camp, enrolling the students in school, working with parents to secure necessary school supplies, lining up medical data, and assisting county agencies in acquiring information which they needed. The majority of the current migrants withdrew in late September. Some of the same students re-entered in May, 1979. These elementary aged current migrant students were administered some pretests. One family was not enrolled long enough for the instructor to do so, and therefore, little interaction is available on these students. Services to the settled-out students began in October. All of these students were English dominant.

The instructor spent mornings at the Conesville Elementary School, meeting in small groups with elementary students in grades one through five. Oral and written communication skills were emphasized in an ESL approach. A pull-out model was utilized in grades one through five. Each of the elementary students were pre- and posttested using the Metropolitan Achievement Tests. Other diagnostic instruments used were the Del Rio Language Screening Test, Carrow Test of Auditory Comprehension, Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, Toronto Test of Receptive Vocabulary, Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Individual goals were established for each elementary student and an individual final report was written on all participants in the program.

A language development approach was utilized with the elementary students. Emphasis was given first to the development of oral language experience and communications skills, and from there to written expression. Both commercial and teacher-made materials were used. Within this context, an experimental approach was used. Heavy use was made of classroom activities, projects, and field trips. Students' compositions and stories were published

in the monthly parent newsletter. Each afternoon the instructor spent one and a half hours in the kindergarten classroom at Columbus Junction Elementary School in a bilingual team-teaching situation with the kindergarten teacher. Both migrant and non-migrant children were taught in English and Spanish by the team.

Junior high and high school students worked with the program instructor one or more times per week, depending upon individual needs. The emphasis at these two levels was tutorial. Initial interviews were conducted with each eligible junior high and high school student. The purposes of the program were discussed and the variety of available services was explained. Students at this level were given the option to participate unless they were specifically referred by a classroom teacher, in which case, the program's instructor automatically initiated intervention services.

Students were selected for the program through standardized test screenings (ITBS), teacher referrals, and at the junior high and high school levels, self-referrals. Each home was visited by the bilingual teacher and signed consent for program participation was secured from the parents.

Objectives of the Program

The objectives of the program were stated in the application as follows:

1. Ninety percent of the students will have gained one year or more grade equivalents in vocabulary pre- and posttesting.
2. Student absenteeism will average three days or less per quarter except for major illness.
3. The home of each participant will have been visited by one or more staff members at least once during the school year.
4. A parent advisory committee, composed of at least three parents of children in the program, will be organized and operational as measured by the minutes of such meetings.
5. Increased involvement from the adult Hispanic community will be obtained, as measured by their attendance at school sponsored events and meetings.
6. Each student in the program will advance to the next grade level at the end of the school year.
7. There will be no drop out students at the junior and high school levels.
8. Seventy-five percent of the students will have gained 15 percentile points or more in vocabulary, as measured by pre- and posttesting.

Completion of Initial Objectives

This section will discuss the degree to which the stated objectives have been met. Some of the testing information is incomplete since a number of

students were not present long enough to be tested.

Attachment A provides information concerning age, grade testing results, and one grade promotion for the migrant participants. It will be noted that in many cases information was not available due to the short time the students were in the district.

Objective #1

Grade equivalent information is not generally provided for students on the kindergarten level. Goal #1 was met by student #10 (MAT and ITBS), #11 (MAT only), #17 (ITBS only), #18 (ITBS only), and #23 (ITBS). Scores in grade equivalents were not available for the rest of the students. These students represented all who were given both a formal pretest and posttest. The reader will note that some of the students made a year or more gain on one test, but not the other (MAT and ITBS).

Although the testing information on the rest of the students is absent, it is encouraging to this evaluator to note that four of the five students showed a year or more growth on the ITBS which was administered in the regular classroom setting. This would indicate that the skills are being transferred to the regular classroom setting. Thus, goal #1 was met by all of the students with pre- and posttest grade equivalent scores. Because of the nature of the high school services, no pre- or posttests were administered.

Attachment B provides information on the same areas for eligible migrant students who did not participate in the program. The test used for the elementary aged students was the Iowa Test of Basic Skills -- Vocabulary. It can be seen that in most areas these students did not quite attain the same gains which were made by students in the program. This would appear to indicate that the program is having a positive impact upon those students who participate.

Objective #2

Attachment C deals with attendance statistics of the migrant children who participated in the program. The current migrants, it will be noted, had excellent attendance during their enrollment period with only three students missing any days. The attendance for the settled-out students indicates that three of the seven students missed more than twelve days of school. All seven of the eligible students who did not participate missed more than twelve days of school. The program did not meet objective #2.

Objective #3

Objective #3 was met. Each home was visited at the beginning of the school year.

Objective #4

Objective #4 was partially met, as evidenced by parental participation at parent conferences and school activities. No statistical information was kept on this objective. However, parents were active in the sign-up of their

children. Some, but not all, did attend parent conferences.

Objective #5

One parent advisory committee meeting was held during the school year. Parents were invited but attendance was very poor. Part of the difficulty originated from the fact that some of the active parents from the previous year moved out of the community, others secured jobs which interfered with their willingness to attend.

Objective #6

No elementary, junior high, or high school students were retained. One student, #10, was advanced to the third grade because of the small class size and the opportunity for individualized instruction.

Objective #7

There were no drop out students at the junior high or high school levels during the period of enrollment.

Objective #8

The reader can refer to Attachment A to note gains in percentile by individual students. As was the case with objective #1, posttest information was not available for the current migrant students, nor were the high school students given pre- and posttests.

Student #1 exceeded objective #8 on the Carrow Test of Auditory Comprehension, the Del Rio Language Screening Test, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Student #2 exceeded on the Del Rio and the Peabody, and gained twelve percentile points on the Toronto Test of Receptive Vocabulary, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, the Word Knowledge Subtest, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary Subtest). Student #11 met the objective as measured by the Metropolitan Achievement Test (Word Knowledge) and the Toronto. Student #17 met the objective as measured by the Toronto, but did not meet the objective as measured by Gates-MacGinitie (Vocabulary Subtest) or the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary). Student #18 met the objective as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Vocabulary), but did not meet the objective as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie (Vocabulary). Student #23 showed a rise of three percentile points according to the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. Since this individual was in close to two standard deviation below the mean, this gain is better than it appears initially.

In summary, all but one of the students tested showed a gain of more than 15 percentile points according to at least one of the instruments used. The performance, however, was not consistent on all tests which the students took.

Successes of the Program

In the opinions of this evaluator, the major strengths of the program were:

1. Provision for a means of communication between home and school.
2. The emphasis on oral language development at the elementary level. Feedback from teachers, available testing information, and student performance, indicate this approach has been successful.
3. The contributions made by the program's instructor to the regular school curriculum. At the elementary level, the instructor worked closely with the kindergarten teacher and remedial reading teacher in diagnosis and prescriptive instruction. At the junior high and high school level, the assistance of the instructor was frequently requested by the teachers in the regular classroom.
4. The team teaching approach used in the kindergarten classroom. Testing results and teacher observation indicated the results were better than were hoped for when the practice was implemented.
5. Increased willingness by the junior high and high school students to request assistance from the program's instructor. This was noted particularly toward the end of the year when it was evident to some of the students that their grades were in jeopardy.
6. The in-school retention rate of high school students. No students were lost as drop outs.
7. The increased awareness by school staff of learning needs of bilingual students. At the time of this writing, a request had been received from two staff members for additional inservice experience related to bilingual education.

Areas of Weakness in the Program

In the opinion of this evaluator, the following were the weaknesses of the program:

1. Lack of staff to handle the influx of current migrants in the fall. There were many small tasks that had to be carried out by the teacher which could have been performed by an aide. This caused a delay in pretesting and did not allow time to do teaching.
2. Inability to formulate an effective parent advisory committee.
3. Lack of sufficient time to work with junior high and high school students. More could have been accomplished on these levels had time been available.
4. Heavy teacher load. It is very difficult for the teacher to cover three buildings in one day and yet meet the needs of the students.

Recommendations

1. That the parent advisory committee be established during the

first month of school and hold a minimum of four meetings.

2. That the emphasis on language development continue at the elementary level.
3. That all students who are eligible receive maintenance services if they are not in the program.
4. That an aide be hired to assist with the influx of migrant children in the fall.
5. That the team teaching approach be utilized in kindergarten and first grade, if at all feasible.
6. That the formal instruction cease prior to the last week of school to provide the program instructor with time to complete documentation and reports.
7. That the diagnostic procedures utilized this year continue.
8. That a volunteer aide program be established to assist with the bilingual program.

ATTACHMENT A

Achievement of Objectives by Migrant Students

Student	Age	Grade	Gain in Vocabulary						Instrument	Promoted to Next Grade Level
			G.E.			Percent				
			Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain		
#1	6	K				51 9 73 +64 8 40 +32 2 62		Met. Readiness Carrow Test Del Rio Peabody	Yes	
#2	5	K				50 75 +25 78 90 12 24 88 +64		Del Rio Carrow Peabody	Yes	
#3	5	K				Pretest below average perfor- mance for 3.1- 3.11 -- Posttest NA		Del Rio Language Screening Test	---	
#4	5	K				10 - NA		Del Rio Language Screening Test (Spanish)	---	
#5	5	K				10 - NA		Del Rio Language Screening Test (Spanish)	---	
#6	5	1				NA			---	
#7	5	1				NA			---	

ATTACHMENT A

Achievement of Objectives by Migrant Students

Student	Age	Grade	Gain in Vocabulary						Instrument	Promoted to Next Grade Level
			S.E.			Percent				
			Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain		
#8	7	2						NA		---
#9	7	2						NA		---
#10	8	2	2.1 1.6	4.1 2.7	+2.0 +1.1	24 50 24	60 90 44	+35 +40 +20	Toronto Test MAT ITBS (Vocabulary)	Yes
#11	9	3	1.2 1.6	3.7 1.9	+2.5 +.3	25 6 7	45 52 6	+20 +46 -1	Toronto Test MAT ITBS (Vocabulary)	Yes
#12	10	4						25% NA		---
#13	12	7			NA			NA	26	---
#14	12	7			NA			NA		---

ATTACHMENT A

Achievement of Objectives by Migrant Students

Student	Age	Grade	Gain in Vocabulary						Instrument	Promoted to Next Grade Level
			G.E.			Percent				
			Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain		
#15	12	7	NA			NA				---
#16	12	7	NA			NA				---
#17	10	4	4.0	3.8	-10	46	28	-18	Gates- MacGinitie Toronto Test ITBS (Vocabulary)	Yes
			2.8	3.7	+9	25	26	+1		
#18	10	4	4.2	4.5	+3	54	44	-10	Gates (Vocabulary) Gates (Total Reading) ITBS (Vocab.)	Yes
			3.7	4.7	+1.0	39	48	+9		
			2.8	4.3	+1.5	16	39	+23		
#19	11	4				34 (English) NA 75 (Spanish) NA				---
#20	NA	4				34 (English) NA 75 (English) NA				---
#21	11	6	NA							---

ATTACHMENT A

Achievement of Objectives by Migrant Students

Student	Age	Grade	Gain in Vocabulary						Instrument	Promoted to Next Grade Level
			G.E.			Percent				
			Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain		
#22	NA	6	NA							---
#23	13	8	3.4	4.5	+1.1	3	6	+3	ITBS (Vocabulary)	Yes
#24	16	10								Yes (One failing grade second semester)
#25	14	9								

ATTACHMENT B

Migrant Non-Participants

Student	Age	Grade	G.E.			Percent			Test	Failed Course	Advanced Grade	Days Absent	Days Present
			Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain					
#1													
#2	10	4	3.0	4.8	+1.8	30	52	+22	ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	13	167
#3	11	5	6.1	6.8	+ .7	85	76	-9	ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	19	161
#4	11	5	3.6	4.4	+ .8	24	23	-1	ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	15	165
#5	11	5	3.9	5.1	-1.2	30	35	+5	ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	13½	166½
#6	14	9							ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	22	158
#7	17	10							ITBS (Vocabulary)	No	Yes	30½	149½

ATTACHMENT C

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Migrant Students

Student	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Days Present	Days Absent
#1	0	0	0	2	168	2
#2	5	2	5	1	167	13
#3	1	-	-	-	25	1
#4 *	0	-	-	-	35	0
#5 *	0	-	-	-	25	0
#6 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#7 *	0	-	-	-	25	0
#8 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#9 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#10	0	0	0	0	180	0
#11	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	0	0	179 $\frac{1}{2}$	0
#12 *	2 $\frac{1}{2}$	-	-	-		
#13 *	0	-	-	-	22 $\frac{1}{2}$	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
#14 *	0	-	-	-	25	0
#15	0	-	-	-	2	0
#16 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#17	0	2	1	7	169	11
#18	3	0	0	0	177	3
#19 *	3	-	-	-	22	3
#20 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#21 *	4	-	-	-	21	4
#22 *	0	-	-	-	2	0
#23	13	1	4	1	161	19
#24					163	17
#25 *	0	-	-	-	19	0

* Indicates current migrants

ATTACHMENT D

Number of Days Absent Per Quarter for Eligible Non-Participants

Student	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Total	
#1	0	7	5	8	160	20
#2	0	10	1	7	162	18
#3	0	10	0	9	161	19
#4	7	2	4	0	165	15
#5	10½	1	2	0	166½	13½
#6					158	22
#7					149½	30½

MUSCATINE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

Narrative Evaluation

by
Jerry W. Lange

MUSCATINE SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1979

Narrative Evaluation

Introduction

Washington School, a modern air conditioned physical plant, was utilized for the first time as the attendance center for Muscatine's summer school educational activities.

Program components included the language development program for migrant children, the early learning program, and the summer string program.

Mathematics and Language Development Programs

The financial resources of Migrant Grant No. 507M were utilized to provide a six week summer session of compensatory educational opportunities for students who typically function one to three years below the grade level commonly associated with their age groups.

These summer program components were initiated Thursday, June 28, 1979, and concluded after twenty-nine daily sessions on Wednesday, August 8, 1979.

A continuous progress multi-age grouping approach to the instructional task was provided for the language development program participants.

Our first instructional priority was to identify each student's functional reading, spelling, and math skills levels to allow the summer staff to develop a program designed to afford maximum assistance in the acquisition of new language skills of expression and comprehension as well as the improvement of basic math concepts.

Upon entry into the program, the migrant students were administered pre-tests to diagnose specific skills needs in reading and math to be followed by the prescription of an individualized program of instruction.

Students were posttested upon completion of learning activities covering specific reading skills and upon completion of instructional activities designed for mastery of basic computational skills in math.

Bilingual Mexican-American students were taught basic phonics and the decoding skills utilizing the "English as a Second Language" instructional technique.

The ESL textbook series, English Around the World (Scott-Foresman Company) was successfully utilized as our basic reading/language text for the various levels of student development. This flexible, ungraded program, guides children to learn English as they did their first language -- by listening and speaking.

The five language development summer sessions instructors were bilingual, with four having previously taught during last year's summer program.

Enrollment statistics reveal a sizeable increase in this year's language development migrant attendance with an average daily attendance of 111.5 as compared to last summer's 92.6 students.

Total enrollment figures for the language development migrant program included 69 interstate, 3 intrastate, and 93 "settled-out" Hispanic students. The interstate and intrastate categories include those students whose parents have traveled from another state (interstate) or within the State of Iowa (intrastate) in pursuit of agricultural field work as well as the families that have decided to "settle-out" but have resided in this area for less than one year.

Reports of the day-by-day comparison of the language development average daily attendance for the past three summers are shown in Attachment A.

See Attachment B for a complete language development enrollment report by school districts for the past five summers.

The type of individualized continuous progress programming we conduct designed for educationally disadvantaged students, necessitates maintenance of reasonable student-teacher ratios within each classroom. The language development's program's pupil teacher ratio was 22.3 to 1. The migrant class size (22.3) exceeded the desirable number of students to be assigned to each classroom when an individualized instructional approach is utilized.

In terms of satisfying or fulfilling the stated program goals and objectives, we feel the language development program was very successful.

The following goals and objectives were identified to provide program direction and to measure instructional effectiveness.

Program Goals Development and reinforcement of reading, language, and math skills of the enrollees.

Development of positive student attitudes toward school and about themselves through utilization of an individualized continuous progress approach.

Enriching the experiences of our migrant, settled-out migrant, via field trips.

Performance Objectives Early primary level enrollees will be expected to achieve an average gain of 25 percentile points during the six week summer session as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test (Levels I and II).

By the end of the six week instructional program the average reading skills growth of the late primary and intermediate level students will be ten (10) as measured by the Fountain Valley Reading Assessment Program.

The basic computational math skills of the late primary and intermediate level students will improve at an average rate of 1.5 months during the six week instructional program as measured by the Houghton-Mifflin Individualized Computational Skills pre and post assessment instruments.

Language Development Evaluation

Level I, Forms P and Q, of the 1976 edition of the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test were administered to the language development early primary level students in a pre- and post- sequence to measure growth during the six week session.

Our four to seven year olds, most of whom were just beginning to acquire English as a second language, gained an average 21.5 percentile points as reflected by our Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test results. While this age group did not quite achieve our performance objective of 25 percentile points, certainly their language skills improvement was substantial during a short six week span of summer programming.

The remainder of the language development students ranging in age from 7-14, surpassed our program objective for acquisition of ten reading/language skills by gaining an average of 18.2 reading/language skills as measured by the Fountain Valley Reading Assessment Program.

The Individualized Computational Skills Program achievement tests, Forms A and B, administered in a pre- and posttest sequence, revealed an average math skills growth of six months by migrant students in the 6-14 age range during our brief summer session. Thus, the language development students exceeded the program's performance objective of 1.5 months by 4.5 months, which represents exceptional skills advancement. See Attachment C for a complete test summary.

Program Critique

The recruitment efforts of our language development staff were especially successful this year. As a result, our summer attendance exceeded that of the past several summers.

The majority of this summer's language development enrollees (56%), were from settled-out families with the remaining 44% categorized as interstate/intrastate migrant children.

While the Muscatine summer migrant program provides supplemental educational experiences for children residing within the boundaries of three local school districts, the preponderance of summer participants (135) resided within the confines of one district, the Muscatine Community School District.

A continuing trend away from rural "camp" housing for the true migrant families was apparent as many of these families located temporary housing in rented homes and apartments within this community. The only children who resided in migrant camps were transported from the L and M School District.

Washington Elementary School proved to be an educational facility well designed for the conduct of summer educational activities. Its central air conditioning and the immediate accessibility of classrooms to the multi-media resources in the Media Center, offered an ideal learning environment.

In conclusion, I sincerely believe the language development program has provided one of the most effective educational approaches to summer programming yet conceived. In my opinion, the diagnostic pre- and posttest results,

the positive individual student reactions to their daily classroom routine, and the individual pupil progress records maintained throughout the six week term, offer supportive evidence that our summer educational sessions have successfully provided appropriate compensatory educational experiences which contribute significantly to the educational advancement of the migrant students.

I recommend continuation of the present program organization during the summer of 1980.

ATTACHMENT A

MUSCATINE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUMMER PROGRAM

ATTENDANCE COMPARISON

Program	Number in Attendance		
	Summer 1977	Summer 1978	Summer 1979
1st	49	67	92
2nd	83	81	97
3rd	70	66	107
4th	92	93	108
5th	94	98	92
6th	89	96	104
7th	99	90	107
8th	105	99	108
9th	110	94	121
10th	111	93	127
11th	101	90	122
12th	93	85	114
13th	114	94	121
14th	115	77	110
15th	121	89	113
16th	129	96	119
17th	123	102	116
18th	111	97	114
19th	125	111	121
20th	114	100	126
21st	121	97	123
22nd	96	101	95
23rd	101	110	120
24th	103	99	104
25th	116	96	113
26th	106	93	113
27th	74	81	103
28th	96	96	112
29th	103	94	112

Average Daily Attendance: 100.6 92.6 111.5

ATTACHMENT B

MUSCATINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUMMER PROGRAM

ENROLLMENT REPORT

August 1979

(1) Muscatine Community School District

Student	Migrant	Summer(s) Attended					Total
		1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	
N		x	x	x	x	x	5
N				x	x	x	3
T			x	x	x	x	4
A			x	x	x	x	4
B		x	x	x	x	x	5
M		x	x	x	x	x	5
B					x	x	2
J					x	x	2
G				x	x	x	3
R			x	x	x	x	4
A				x	x	x	3
L						x	1
B						x	1
J						x	1
E	x				x	x	2
A					x	x	1
G						x	1
L		x	x	x	x	x	5
L					x	x	2
M						x	1
B	x					x	1
D	x	x	x	x	x	x	5
M	x				x	x	2
S	x	x	x	x	x	x	5
D					x	x	2
S	x					x	1
V	x					x	1
D		x	x	x	x	x	5
F			x	x	x	x	4
G		x	x	x	x	x	5
J						x	1
R						x	1
V			x	x	x	x	4
C						x	1
L						x	1
P						x	1
P						x	1
Y						x	1
D	x					x	1
E				x	x	x	3
G	x					x	1

Muscatine Community School District (cont.)

Student	Migrant	1975	Summer(s) Attended				1979	Total
			1976	1977	1978			
J				x	x		x	3
L	x						x	1
S	x						x	1
S	x						x	1
H							x	1
E	x						x	1
W	x						x	1
M							x	1
R							x	1
J	x						x	1
L	x						x	1
M	x						x	1
M	x						x	1
O	x						x	1
P	x						x	1
D	x						x	1
F	x						x	1
S	x						x	1
D							x	1
E							x	1
Y							x	1
G				x	x		x	3
M							x	1
S							x	1
R							x	1
S							x	1
S	x						x	1
H	x						x	1
P	x						x	1
R	x						x	1
J							x	1
J							x	1
S							x	1
S							x	1
E						x	x	2
C	x						x	1
F	x						x	1
E	x						x	1
E	x						x	1
E	x						x	1
J	x						x	1
H							x	1
H							x	1
H							x	1
H							x	1
R	x	x	x	x	x		x	5
D	x						x	1
F	x						x	1
J	x						x	1
B		x	x	x	x		x	5
J		x	x	x	x		x	5

Muscatine Community School District (cont.)

Student	Migrant	Summer(s) Attended				1979	Total
		1975	1976	1977	1978		
R					X	X	2
C				X	X	X	3
J				X	X	X	3
J	X					X	1
C					X	X	2
D				X	X	X	3
A					X	X	2
A						X	1
J					X	X	2
R	X					X	1
C	X				X	X	2
G	X				X	X	2
C						X	1
E						X	1
J						X	1
C	X					X	1
M	X					X	1
Y	X					X	1
G		X	X	X	X	X	5
M				X	X	X	3
S						X	1
S		X	X	X	X	X	5
E						X	1
V				X	X	X	3
E				X	X	X	3
M					X	X	2
E						X	1
N	X					X	1
B						X	1
J						X	1
N						X	1
N						X	1
R	X					X	1
C						X	1
J						X	1
N						X	1
C						X	1
I					X	X	2
I				X	X	X	3
M		X	X	X	X	X	5
E		X	X	X	X	X	5
T						X	1

RECORD OF TOTAL YEARS ATTENDED

Number attended 1 year 86
 Number attended 2 years 16
 Number attended 3 years 13
 Number attended 4 years 5
 Number attended 5 years 15
 Migrant Eligibility Students 46
 5 Year Eligibility Students 89

ATTACHMENT B

MUSCATINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUMMER PROGRAM

ENROLLMENT REPORT

August 1979

(2) West Liberty Community School District

Student	Migrant	1975	Summer(s) Attended				1979	Total
			1976	1977	1978			
E	x		x	x	x	x	x	4
J	x				x	x	x	2
M	x		x	x	x	x	x	4
C					x	x	x	2
E	x					x	x	1
G	x					x	x	1
H	x					x	x	1
M	x					x	x	1
N	x					x	x	1
B	x				x	x	x	2
C	x			x	x	x	x	3
E	x			x	x	x	x	3
G						x	x	1
M	x					x	x	1
P	x					x	x	1
C	x					x	x	1
J	x					x	x	1
S	x					x	x	1
J						x	x	1
N						x	x	1

RECORD OF TOTAL YEARS ATTENDED

Number Attended 1 Year	13
Number Attended 2 Years	3
Number Attended 3 Years	2
Number Attended 4 Years	2
Number Attended 5 Years	0
Migrant Eligibility Students	16
5 Year Eligibility Students	4

ATTACHMENT B

MUSCATINE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT SUMMER PROGRAM ENROLLMENT REPORT

August 1979

(3) L & M Community School District

Student	Migrant	Summer(s) Attended				1979	Total
		1975	1976	1977	1978		
D J R A M I D R D G	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1
	X					X	1

RECORD OF TOTAL YEARS ATTENDED

Number Attended 1 Year	10
Number Attended 2 Years	0
Number Attended 3 Years	0
Number Attended 4 Years	0
Number Attended 5 Years	0
Migrant Eligibility Students	10
5 Year Eligibility Students	0

ATTACHMENT C

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT READING

Activity	Level	Test Code	Type of Score	Number Children Pre-Post Tested	Average Skills Gain	Subjective Evaluation Rating				
						High		Low		
						1	2	3	4	5
Reading	4-6	Metr. Rdg. Rdns.	%	18	23%	X				
Reading	5-7	Metr. Rdg. Rdns.	%	15	20%		X			
Reading	6-8	Fountain Valley	Skills	21	20.6	X				
Reading	8-12	Fountain Valley	Skills	19	12.0	X				
Reading	10-15	Fountain Valley	Skills	24	22	X				

Average Readiness Gain = 21.5

Average Skills Gain = 18.2

ATTACHMENT C

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT MATH

Activity	Level	Test Code	Type of Score	Number Pre-Tested	Date of Pretest		Average Pretest Score	Number Post Tested	Date of Posttest		Average Post Test Score	Subjective Evaluation Rating				
					Yr.	Mo.			Yr.	Mo.		1	2	3	4	5
Math	5-7	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	21	79	7	1.3	20	79	8	1.8	X				
Math	6-8	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	21	79	7	2.5	21	79	8	2.8	X				
Math	8-12	Form A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	28	79	7	4.2	21	79	8	4.8	X				
Math	10-15	FORM A&B I.C.S.P.	Grade Equiv.	23	79	7	5.1	23	79	8	6.1	X				

Pretest Average Grade Equivalent = 3.2

Posttest Average Grade Equivalent = 3.8

Average Grade Equivalent Growth = 6 months

WEST LIBERTY REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Narrative Evaluation

by
Delmar T. Jeneary

WEST LIBERTY REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Fiscal Year 1979

Narrative Evaluation

The primary goal of the West Liberty educational program is to provide a means for migrant youngsters to become functional in English and the basic skills areas as quickly as possible. The hope is that these youngsters will be as scholastically capable as their Anglo non-migrant peers as a result of program efforts.

More specifically, the objectives of the West Liberty migrant education program are as follows:

1. To increase parental involvement in school through such means as:

- registration of migrant youngsters in school
- parent-teacher conferences (with the regular and bilingual resource teacher in attendance)
- participation as homeroom mothers, etc.

It is noted too, that program success occurs through the successes of the children with the parents seeing their child's success. We have been very pleased in this area.

2. To increase cultural pluralism through such means as:

- Christmas program presented by Spanish-speaking youngsters for all elementary school students in which costumes, etc., are depicted and portrayed (We continue to work toward this goal.)

3. To increase school attendance (Success here is measured according to individual families.)

4. To increase socialization between Anglos and Chicanos (Excellent success)

5. To deliver special services, such as:

- hearing referral and assistance
- speech referral and assistance
- special education assistance
- visual referral and assistance
- medical referral and assistance

We have received excellent cooperation between local agencies and the school.

6. To prepare migrant learners to compete successfully in an Anglo world through such means as:

- assisting them in increasing their ability in English
- assisting them in becoming proficiently bilingual

It is noted here that West Liberty has become a community in which the migrant worker "settles out". The local turkey processing plant and other local or nearby industries provide year-round employment for these "settled-out" migrants. The bilingual program conducted in West Liberty is unique in that it is conducted during the regular school year with a significant number of "settled-out" migrant learners.

In this program, the bilingual resource teacher approach is employed to provide extra help to students for approximately a thirty minute period per day. Here again, the major emphasis is upon developing proficiency in English as soon as possible, with Spanish as a vehicle.

The bilingual portion of the West Liberty migrant education program can be further described as attempting to rank learners according to their language development level. Four categories arranged in priority ranking illustrate the program:

1. Monolingual Spanish Speaking

Youngsters in this category are totally Spanish speaking. They receive first priority within the program and the greatest possible amount of assistance from the bilingual teacher(s).

2. Little to no English Speaking Ability

These youngsters are just beginning to function bilingually. While ranked as second in priority, they too receive significant support from the bilingual teacher(s).

3. Speaks English with Difficulty in Academic (Content) Areas

These youngsters are ranked third in program priority. The bilingual teacher(s) provides help in the polishing of skills necessary to function successfully in the content areas.

4. Full Functioning Member of an Academic Classroom

These youngsters are ranked fourth in program priority. They need and receive special help from the bilingual teacher in areas of culture (adaptation to the Anglo culture), plus maintenance of their ability in Spanish where deemed necessary. This group is receiving the least attention presently.

The Houghton-Mifflin reading tests are applied in each of these category areas from kindergarten on through subsequent grades. Learners in category #4 are capable of working and do receive the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and other achievement/intelligence instruments as their application is felt to be valid.